CITY OF ABERDEEN (PWS 6060001)
SOURCE WATER ASSESSMENT FINAL REPORT

May 3, 2002

State of Idaho
Department of Environmental Quality

Executive Summary

Under the Safe Drinking Water Act Amendments of 1996, all states are required by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) to assess every source of public drinking water for its relative sensitivity to contaminants regulated by the act. This assessment is based on a land use inventory of the designated assessment area and sensitivity factors associated with the wells and aquifer characteristics.

This report, *Source Water Assessment for the City of Aberdeen, Idaho* describes the public drinking water system, the boundaries of the zones of water contribution, and the associated potential contaminant sources located within these boundaries. This assessment should be used as a planning tool, taken into account with local knowledge and concerns, to develop and implement appropriate protection measures for this source. **The results should not be used as an absolute measure of risk and they should not be used to undermine public confidence in the water system.**

The City of Aberdeen (Public Water System 6060001) drinking water system currently consists of four well sources: Well #1, Well #2, Well #3 and Well #4. The wells are located within the City of Aberdeen and pump directly into the distribution system. The public water system serves approximately 1850 persons.

The potential contaminant sources identified within the delineated time-of-travel (TOT) zones included two major transportation corridors (Highway 39 and Highway 26), a major railroad corridor, and irrigation canals. There are aboveground storage tanks (ASTs), underground storage tanks (USTs) and leaking underground storage tanks (LUSTs), SARA (Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Facilities), RCRA (Sites regulated under the Resource Conservation Recovery Act) and Group 1 Sites (sites that show elevates levels of contaminants and are not within the priority one areas). Other sources that may contribute to the overall vulnerability of the water source were business mailing list sites that may be considered potential contaminants sources. A complete list of these sources is provided with this assessment.

For the assessment, a review of laboratory tests for the Aberdeen system was conducted. Between 1994 and 1999, total coliform bacteria were detected at various locations within the distribution system. When follow-up tests were completed, the source of the bacteria was identified and when necessary the distribution system was chlorinated. No total coliform bacteria were found present in the distribution system during the years 2000 and 2001. No synthetic organic chemicals (SOCs) have been detected in the water samples taken at the Aberdeen wells. However, there have been volatile organic chemicals (VOCs), inorganic chemicals (IOCs) and radionuclides (RADs) identified. Well #1 detected nitrate and tetrachloroethylene between September 1993 and September 2001. Well #2 detected barium, fluoride, nitrate and sodium between October 1993 and September 2001. For Well #3, there were detects of fluoride, nitrate, gross alpha, gross beta, radium-226 and sodium between October 1993 and September 2001. Well #4 detected barium, calcium, fluoride, gross alpha, gross beta, nitrate, and sodium between July 1992 and September 2001. All contaminants tested for Well #1, Well #2, Well #3 and Well #4 did not meet or exceed the maximum contaminant level (MCL) set by the EPA for each chemical.

The nitrate history (between the years of 1992 and 2001) for the Aberdeen wells show that all samples taken were below the MCL of 10.0 milligrams per liter (mg/L). Nitrate concentrations from Well #1 ranged from 3.4 mg/L to 5.3 mg/L with a peak concentration in December 1994. One of the nine samples taken at Well #1 was above the active level (greater than half the MCL). Nitrate results for Well #2 ranged from 0.76 mg/L to 2.3 mg/L. Well #3 nitrate concentrations ranged from 0.11 mg/L to 2.1 mg/L. The results for Well #4 ranged from 1.19 mg/L to 2.3 mg/L.

A Sanitary Survey was conducted by the Idaho Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) in January 1999 for the City of Aberdeen. The survey provides an overview and needed improvements to the public water system. Improvements were to install discharge to waste capabilities for Well #1, Well #2 and Well #4. Also, the system should locate the discharge on the existing floor drains for Well #2 and Well #3.

The susceptibility ratings for the City of Aberdeen drinking water system were based upon available information relating to soil drainage characteristics, agricultural land use, system construction, and potential contaminant sources identified within each well's zones of contribution. The final susceptibility ranking for Well #1 is rated moderate for SOCs, and high for IOCs, VOCs and microbial contaminants. Well #2 and Well #4 are rated high for IOCs, VOCs, SOCs, and microbial contaminants. Well #3 is rated moderate for IOCs, VOCs, SOCs and microbial contaminants.

This assessment should be used as a basis for determining appropriate new protection measures or re-evaluating existing protection efforts. No matter what ranking a source receives, protection is always important. Whether the source is currently located in a "pristine" area or an area with numerous industrial and/or agricultural land uses that require surveillance, the way to ensure good water quality in the future is to act now to protect valuable water supply resources. If the system should need to expand in the future, new well sites should be located in areas with as few potential sources of contamination as possible, and the site should be reserved and protected for this specific use.

For the City of Aberdeen, drinking water protection activities should focus on correcting any deficiencies outlined in the sanitary survey (an inspection conducted every five years with the purpose of determining the physical condition of a water system's components and its capacity). There should be no application or storage of herbicides, pesticides, or other chemicals within 50 feet of a public water system well. Another protective measure would be to limit the use of roads that pass within 50 feet of a well. The system should continue their efforts to keep the distribution system free of microbial contamination. Any new sources that could be considered potential contaminants that reside within a well's zones of contribution should be investigated and monitored to evaluate the threat of contamination the source may pose in the future. Land uses within most of the source water assessment area are outside the direct jurisdiction of the City of Aberdeen. Therefore partnerships with state and local agencies, industrial and commercial groups should be established to ensure future land uses are protective of ground water quality. Educating employees and the public about source water will further assist the system in its monitoring and protection efforts.

Due to the time involved with the movement of ground water, drinking water protection activities should be aimed at long-term management strategies even though these strategies may not yield results in the near term. A strong public education program should be a primary focus of any drinking water protection plan as the delineation encompasses much urban and commercial land uses. Public education topics could include proper lawn and garden care practices, household hazardous waste disposal methods, proper care and maintenance of septic systems, and the importance of water conservation to name but a few. There are multiple resources available to help communities implement protection programs, including the Drinking Water Academy of the EPA. Drinking water protection activities for agriculture should be coordinated with the Idaho State Department of Agriculture and the Bingham County Soil and Water Conversation District. As major transportation corridors that intersect the delineation (such as Highways 39 and 26), the Idaho Department of Transportation should be involved in protection efforts. If the system should need to expand in the future, new well sites should be located in areas with as few potential sources of contamination as possible, and the site should be reserved and protected for this specific use.

A system must incorporate a variety of strategies in order to develop a comprehensive drinking water protection plan, be they regulatory in nature (i.e. zoning, permitting) or non-regulatory in nature (i.e. good housekeeping, public education, specific best management practices). For assistance in developing protection strategies please contact the Pocatello Regional Office of the DEQ or the Idaho Rural Water Association.

SOURCE WATER ASSESSMENT FOR
CITY OF ABERDEEN, IDAHO

Section 1. Introduction - Basis for Assessment

The following sections contain information necessary to understand how and why this assessment was conducted. **It is important to review this information to understand what the ranking of this source means.** A map showing the delineated source water assessment area and the inventory of significant potential sources of contamination identified within that area are contained in this report. The list of significant potential contaminant source categories and their rankings used to develop this assessment is also attached.

Background

Under the Safe Drinking Water Act Amendments of 1996, all states are required by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) to assess every source of public drinking water for its relative susceptibility to contaminants regulated by the Safe Drinking Water Act. This assessment is based on a land use inventory of the delineated assessment area and sensitivity factors associated with the wells and aquifer characteristics.

Level of Accuracy and Purpose of the Assessment

Since there are over 2,900 public water sources in Idaho, there is limited time and resources to accomplish the assessments. All assessments must be completed by May of 2003. An in-depth, site-specific investigation of each significant potential source of contamination is not possible. **Therefore, this assessment should be used as a planning tool, taken into account with local knowledge and concerns, to develop and implement appropriate protection measures for this source. The results should <u>not be</u> used as an absolute measure of risk and they should <u>not be</u> used to undermine public confidence in the water system.**

The ultimate goal of the assessment is to provide data to local communities to develop a protection strategy for their drinking water supply system. The Idaho Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) recognizes that pollution prevention activities generally require less time and money to implement than treatment of a public water supply system once it has been contaminated. DEQ encourages communities to balance resource protection with economic growth and development. The information necessary to develop a drinking water protection program should be determined by the local community and be based upon its own needs and limitations. Wellhead or drinking water protection is one facet of a comprehensive growth plan, and it can complement ongoing local planning efforts.

Section 2. Conducting the Assessment

General Description of the Source Water Quality

The City of Aberdeen is a community public drinking water system located in Bingham County. It is approximately 16 miles north of the City of American Falls and is accessible by Highway 39 (Figure 1). This s ystem currently has four well sources that serve about 1,850 persons with 750 connections. At this time, there appears to be no primary water quality issues associated with the system.

A review of the City of Aberdeen water chemistry history was conducted using the Idaho Drinking Water Information Management System (DWIMS), the State Drinking Water Information System (SDWIS), and hardcopy laboratory results. No synthetic organic contaminants (SOCs) were detected in the water samples taken from the public drinking water wells. Volatile organic contaminants (VOCs), inorganic contaminants (IOCs), and radionuclides (RADs) were detected in the wells but were below the maximum contaminant level (MCL) set by the EPA.

Well #1 is located at the base of an abandoned water storage tank near an alley between 1st and 2nd East Streets and Lincoln and Central Avenue. The VOC, tetrachloroethylene, was detected at the well in December 1995, June 1996, and September 1996 with concentrations of 0.55, 0.83 and 0.80 micrograms per liter (µg/L) respectively. These results were below the MCL of 5.0 µg/L. Nitrate results, between October 1993 and September 2001, ranged from 3.4 milligrams per liter (mg/L) to 5.3 mg/L, with the peak concentration in December 1994. Although the nitrate history for Well #1 shows the results below the MCL of 10.0 mg/L, one of nine samples taken was above the active level (greater than half the MCL). No additional IOCs or SOCs have been detected in Well #1.

Well #2 is located north of the Aberdeen School District #58 Elementary School near the intersection of 4th West Street and Central Avenue. Between October 1993 and September 2001, barium, fluoride, nitrate, and sodium were detected at the well source. The reported concentrations of the chemicals identified were below the MCL for each chemical. The nitrate results ranged from 0.76 mg/L to 2.3 mg/L with the peak concentration in August 1999.

Well #3 is located near the intersection of Main Street and Custer Avenue. The water samples taken between October 1993 and September 2001 detected fluoride, nitrate, gross alpha, gross beta, radium-226 and sodium, all of which were below the MCL for each chemical. The nitrate concentrations for Well #3 ranged from 0.11 mg/L to 2.1 mg/L, with a peak result taken in July 2000.

Well #4 is located near the intersection of Cassia Avenue and 1st East Street. The water samples taken between July 1992 and September 2001 detected barium, calcium, fluoride, gross alpha, gross beta, nitrate, and sodium. All chemicals identified in Well #4 were below their designated MCL. Nitrate results ranged from 1.19 mg/L to 2.3 mg/L with a peak result taken in August 1999.

Figure 1 - Geographic Location of the City of Aberdeen (PWS 6060001) Well #1, Well #2, Well #3, and Well #4



Additionally, there have been detects of total coliform bacteria within the distribution system, but no bacterial contamination has been found at the wellheads. Once bacterial contamination was identified, the system located the source and chlorinated the distribution system if necessary. Refer to Attachment A – Figure 2 for well locations.

Defining the Zones of Contribution--Delineation

The delineation process establishes the physical area around a well that will become the focal point of the assessment. The process includes mapping the boundaries of the zone of contribution into time-of-travel zones (zones indicating the number of years necessary for a particle of water to reach a pumping well) for water in the aquifer. Washington Group International (WGI) was contracted by DEQ to define the public water system's zones of contribution. WGI used a refined computer model approved by the EPA in determining the 3-year (Zone 1B), 6-year (Zone 2), and 10-year (Zone 3) Time-of-Travel (TOT) for water associated with the East Margin Area of the Eastern Snake River Plain (ESRP) hydrologic province. The City of Aberdeen falls within this hydrologic province. The computer model was assimilated by the WGI using site specific data from a variety of sources including nearby well logs, operator records, and hydrogeologic reports. Although there are four drinking water wells associated with this system, the delineation in this assessment represents all wells based upon similarities in hydrogeologic characteristics. A summary of the hydrogeologic information from the WGI Source Area Delineation Report is provided below.

The East Margin Area encompasses 821 square miles, representing approximately 8 percent of the total area of the ESRP hydrologic province. The majority of the East Margin Area is within Bingham County, with small areas occurring in Bannock, Bonneville, and Power counties.

The regional ESRP aquifer is the most significant aquifer in the East Margin Area and consists primarily of basalt of the Quaternary-aged Snake River Group. However, additional water-bearing units are used for water supply along the margin of the ESRP. In order of decreasing age, the most significant aquifers in the Michaud Flats area are bedded rhyolite (volcanic rock) of the Tertiary-aged Starlight Formation and Quaternary-aged pediment gravels formed by running water, basalt of the Big Hole Formation, and stream deposits of the Sunbeam Formation (see Jacobson, 1982, p. 7, and Corbett, et al., 1980, pp. 6-10). A few shallow domestic wells in the central Michaud Flats area also are completed in Michaud Gravel, which is the shallow water-table aquifer. The American Falls Lake Beds Formation (AFLB) confines the deeper aquifers and averages 80 feet in thickness in the central Michaud Flats area (Jacobson, 1984, p. 6). The AFLB pinches out in the eastern Michaud Flats area near the Portneuf River, effectively combining the shallow and deep stream deposits into a single water table aquifer (Bechtel, 1994, p. 2-2). Other aquifers in the East Margin Area include fractured quartzite that has been developed near Blackfoot, stream deposits near the cities of Firth and Basalt, and pediment gravels in the Gibson Terrace area near Tyhee and Chubbuck.

Public water system (PWS) wells in the East Margin Area of the ESRP province produce water from five different aquifers: the Regional Eastern Snake River Plain aquifer, three alluvial (or stream deposited) aquifers (Eastern Michaud Flats, Firth/Basalt, and Gibson Terrace/Pocatello Bench) and a quartzite aquifer (Blackfoot). The conceptual model for the Regional Eastern Snake River Plain Aquifer in which the City of Aberdeen public water system resides is presented below.

Regional Eastern Snake River Plain Aquifer

The ESRP is a northeast trending basin located in southeastern Idaho. The 10,000 square miles of the plain are primarily filled with highly fractured layered Quaternary-aged basalt flows of the Snake River Group, which are between layers of rocks formed by sediment deposition along the margins (Garabedian, 1992, p. 5). Quaternary-aged basalts are estimated to be 100 to 1,500 feet thick, with the majority of the area in the range of 100 to 500 feet thick (Whitehead, 1992, Plate 3). Individual basalt flows range from 10 to 50 feet thick, averaging 20 to 25 feet thick (Lindholm, 1996, p. 14). Basalt is thickest in the central part of the eastern plain and thins toward the margins. Whitehead (1992, p. 9) estimates the total thickness of the flows to be as great as 5,000 feet. A thin layer (0 to 100 feet) of windblown and stream-produced sediments overlies the basalt. The plain is bounded on the northeast by rocks of the Yellowstone Group (mainly rhyolite) and Idavada Volcanics to the southwest. These rocks may also underlie the plain (Garabedian, 1992, p. 5). Granite of the Idaho batholith borders the plain to the northwest, along with sedimentary rocks and metamorphic rocks (altered by heat and/or pressure) (Cosgrove et al., 1999, p. 10). The Snake River flows along part of the southern boundary and is the only drainage that leaves the plain. A high degree of connectivity with the regional aquifer system is displayed over much of the river as it passes through the plain. However, some reaches are believed to be perched or separated from the main ground water by unsaturated rock, such as the Lewisville-to-Shelly reach. Rivers and streams entering the plain from the south are tributary to the Snake River. With the exception of the Big and Little Wood rivers, rivers entering from the north vanish into the basalts of the Snake River Plain aquifer that have a higher ability to transmit water.

The layered basalts of the Snake River Group host one of the most productive aquifers in the United States. The aquifer is generally considered unconfined, yet may be confined locally because of interbedded clay and dense unfractured basalt (Whitehead, 1992, p. 26). Whitehead (1992, p. 22) and Lindholm (1996, p.1) report that well yields of 2,000 to 3,000 gal/min are common for wells open to less than 100 feet of the aquifer. Transmissivities obtained from test data in the upper 100 to 200 feet of the aquifer range from less than 0.1 ft^2/sec to 56 ft^2/sec ($1.0x10^4$ to $4.8x10^6$ ft^2/day; Garabedian, 1992, p. 11, and Lindholm, 1996, p. 18). Lindholm (1996, p. 18) estimates aquifer thickness to range from 100 feet near the plain's margin to thousands of feet near the center. Models of the regional aquifer have used values ranging from 200 to 3,000 feet to represent aquifer thickness (Cosgrove et al., 1999, p. 15).

Regional ground water flow is to the southwest paralleling the basin (Cosgrove et al., 1999; deSonneville, 1972, p. 78; Garabedian, 1992, p. 48; and Lindholm, 1996, p. 23). Reported water table gradients range from 3 to 100 ft/mile and average 12 ft/mile (Lindholm, 1996, p. 22). Gradients steepen at the plain's margin and at discharge locations. The estimated effective ratio of the rock's open space volume to its total volume range from 0.04 to more than 0.25 (Ackerman, 1995, p.1, and Lindholm, 1996, p. 16).

The majority of aquifer recharge results from surface water irrigation activities (incidental recharge), which divert water from the Snake River and its tributaries (Ackerman, 1995, p. 4, and Garabedian, 1992, p. 11) and locally from canal leakage. Natural recharge occurs through stream losses, direct precipitation, and tributary basin underflow.

Aquifer discharge occurs primarily as seeps and springs on the northern wall of the Snake River canyon near Thousand Springs and near American Falls and Blackfoot (Garabedian, 1992, p. 17). To a lesser degree, discharge also occurs through pumping and underflow.

The East Margin Area is among the most transmissive regions of the regional aquifer, therefore it has a higher ability to transmit water. A transmissivity of 21 ft^2/sec was used to represent the upper 200 feet of the regional aquifer in the East Margin Area in the three-dimensional USGS ground water flow model (Garabedian, 1992, Plate 6). The equivalent hydraulic conductivity or the rate at which water can move through permeable material is 9,072 ft/day. This value is consistent with the range of hydraulic conductivity, the rate water flows through a cross section, (9,500 to 11,708 ft/day) calculated using data from a constant-rate aquifer test conducted in 1981 (Jacobson, 1982, p. 23). This range was calculated by dividing the estimated transmissivity (228,000 to 281,000 ft^2/day) by the perforated interval of the observation well (24 feet). The geometric mean hydraulic conductivity based on analysis of specific capacity data from PWS wells (135 ft/day) is significantly lower.

A published water table map of the Upper Snake River Basin (IDWR, 1997, p. 9) indicates that the ground water flow direction in the ESRP aquifer in the East Margin Area is similar to that depicted at the regional scale (e.g., Garabedian, 1992, Plate 4).

Recharge from precipitation and surface water irrigation in the East Margin Area ranges from less than 10 to more than 20 inches per year (Garabedian,1992, Plate 8). The low end of the range applies to the area near Blackfoot, while the high end applies to the area on the west side of American Falls Reservoir near Aberdeen.

Kjelstrom (1995, p. 13) reports an annual river loss of 280,000 acre-feet to the regional basalt aquifer for the 27.5-mile Lewisville-to-Shelley reach of the Snake River and 110,000 acre-feet for the 23.5-mile Shelley-to-Blackfoot reach. Annual river gains of 1,900,000 acre-feet for the 36.6-mile Blackfoot-to-Neeley reach are also estimated (Kjelstrom, 1995, p. 13). A seepage study conducted in the fall of 1980 on the Portneuf River showed a gain of about 560 ft^3/sec (405,691 acre-feet) for the 13-mile Pocatello-to-American Falls Reservoir reach (Jacobson, 1982, p. 16). The average flow in the Blackfoot River near the city of Blackfoot is low at Station #13068500 (5.2 cfs; USGS, 2001) compared to the flow in the Snake River near the city of Blackfoot at Station #13069500 (2,900 cfs; USGS, 2001).

The delineated source water assessment area for the City of Aberdeen drinking water wells trends in a northeast direction and has an elongated conical shape. The capture zones for the wells within the Regional Eastern Snake River Plain Aquifer have a maximum length of 33 miles (WGI, 2001, p. 18). The delineation for the Aberdeen wells is approximately 36 miles in length with the narrowest area near the wellhead approximately 0.5 of a mile wide. The widest area of the delineation to the north near Highway 26 is approximately 13 miles. The actual data used by WGI in determining the source water assessment delineation are available from DEQ upon request.

Identifying Potential Sources of Contamination

A potential source of contamination is defined as any facility or activity that stores, uses, or produces, as a product or by-product, the contaminants regulated under the Safe Drinking Water Act. Furthermore, these sources have a sufficient likelihood of releasing such contaminants into the environment at levels that could pose a concern relative to drinking water sources. The goal of the inventory process is to locate and describe those facilities, land uses, and environmental conditions that are potential sources of ground water contamination. The locations of potential sources of contamination within the delineation areas were obtained by field surveys conducted by DEQ and from available databases.

The predominant land use for the City of Aberdeen is irrigated agricultural land with residential or urban land use near the wellheads.

It is important to understand that a release may never occur from a potential source of contamination provided best management practices are used at the facility. Many potential sources of contamination are regulated at the federal level, state level, or both to reduce the risk of release. Therefore, when a business, facility, or property is identified as a potential contaminant source, this should not be interpreted to mean that this business, facility, or property is in violation of any local, state, or federal environmental law or regulation. What it does mean is that the potential for contamination exists due to the nature of the business, industry, or operation. There are a number of methods that water systems can use to work cooperatively with potential sources of contamination, such as educational visits and inspections of stored materials. Many owners of such facilities may not even be aware that they are located near a public water supply well.

Contaminant Source Inventory Process

A two-phased contaminant inventory of the study area was conducted during the Winter of 2001-2002. The first phase involved identifying and documenting potential contaminant sources within the City of Aberdeen source water assessment area through the use of computer databases and Geographic Information System (GIS) maps developed by DEQ. The second, or enhanced, phase of the contaminant inventory involved contacting the operator to validate the sources identified in phase one and to add any additional potential sources in the area. This task was undertaken with the assistance of Mr. Richard Mayer, the Public Works Director for the City of Aberdeen. At the time of the enhanced inventory, additional potential contaminant sources were found within the delineated source water area. Maps with well locations, delineated areas and potential contaminant sources are provided with this report (Attachment A – Figure 2). Each potential contaminant source has been given a unique site number that references tabular information associated with the public water well (Attachment A – Table 3). Please note that some sites reflect information accumulated from different databases. For example, if a Potential Contaminant Inventory source site number includes more than one number (i.e. 1, 6), it is referring two different kinds of potential contaminant sources, i.e. leaking underground storage tank (LUST), underground storage tank (UST), associated with one spatial location.

Potential contaminant sources were found within the 3-year, 6-year and 10-year TOT zones, with a majority of those sources in the 3-year TOT zone. In the 3-year TOT zone, there is major transportation corridor, Highway 39, and a major railroad corridor that intersect the delineation. Transportation and railroad corridors could potentially contaminate the ground water by accidental spills or releases. There are aboveground storage tanks (ASTs), USTs and LUSTs that may contain diesel fuel, gasoline, heating oil, or other chemical and petroleum related products. Other sources include those identified under the Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act (SARA), Resource Conservation Recovery Act (RCRA) and Group 1 Sites. Business Mailing List (BML) sources within the delineated zones were also evaluated. Any business that may use or store chemicals that could potentially contaminate the ground water were included in the assessment. The types of businesses identified, and should not be limited to, were auto parts and auto repair stores, auto/motorcycle dealers, tire dealers, a car wash facility, painting supply store, wholesale fertilizers and chemicals facilities, wholesale oils and fuels, and potato growers. Additional sources found were hand-dug wells located to the north of Well #2. There are several surface water sources: the Highline and Lowline Canals, and the Aberdeen Drain. All surface water sources are direct links to the ground water and can introduce bacteria, nitrates, pesticides or sediment from agricultural return drains. In the 6-year and 10-year TOT zones, there were UST sites, a pumice mine, a major transportation corridor (Highway 26), and a railroad corridor. Contaminants of potential concern should be outside of the wellhead's sanitary setback (50-foot radius around the wellhead) to provide additional protection for the well. A review of potential contaminant sources in relation to wellhead locations show the railroad approximately 100 feet from Well #1 with a business storing liquid fertilizer within the sanitary setback . When a potential contaminant source is found within the sanitary setback of a well it will automatically receive a high rating for IOCs and SOCs. A farm chemical storage facility is approximately 100 feet from Well #4 (DEQ, GWUDI Survey 1995). Refer to Attachment A – Table 3 for the complete list of potential contaminant sources. For locations of wells, delineations and potential contaminant sources refer to Attachment A – Figure 2.

Section 3. Susceptibility Analyses

Each well's susceptibility to contamination was ranked as high, moderate, or low risk according to the following considerations: hydrologic characteristics, physical integrity of the well, land use characteristics, and potentially significant contaminant sources. The susceptibility rankings are specific to a particular potential contaminant or category of contaminants. Therefore, a high susceptibility rating relative to one potential contaminant does not mean that the water system is at the same risk for all other potential contaminants. The relative ranking that is derived for a well is a qualitative, screening-level step that, in many cases, uses generalized assumptions and best professional judgement. Attachment B contains a susceptibility analysis worksheet for each well in the assessment. The following summaries describe the rationale for the susceptibility ranking.

Hydrologic Sensitivity

The hydrologic sensitivity of a well is dependent upon four factors. These factors are surface soil composition, the material in the vadose zone (between the land surface and the water table), the depth to first ground water, and the presence of a 50-foot thick fine-grained zone above the water producing zone of the well. Slowly draining soils such as silt and clay typically are more protective of ground water than coarse-grained soils such as sand and gravel. Similarly, fine-grained sediments in the subsurface and a water depth of more than 300 feet from the surface protect the ground water from contamination.

Hydrologic sensitivity was rated moderate for Well #1, Well #2, and Well #4, and low for Well #3 (Table 2). This is based upon regional soil classifications as poor to moderately drained. Soils with poor to moderate drainage characteristics are thought to have better filtration capabilities than faster draining soils. Well #1, Well #2 and Well #4 are considered sensitive due to the lack of information available to determine the vadose zone composition. The depth to first ground water for Well #2 and Well #3 is less than 300 feet from the surface. There was no information for Well #1 and Well #4 to make this assessment. With all factors equal, water taken from a greater ground water depth increases the opportunity for potential contaminant reduction through absorption and/or other dispersion mechanisms (Idaho Source Water Assessment Plan, October 1999, p. E-59). There is no presence of a 50-foot thick fine-grained zone, such as clay, for Well #1, Well #2 and Well #4 to provide a barrier that will help reduce the downward movement of contaminants.

Well Construction

Well construction directly affects the ability of the well to protect the aquifer from contaminants. System construction scores are reduced when information shows that potential contaminants will have a more difficult time reaching the intake of the well. Lower scores imply a system that can better protect the water. If the casing and annular seal both extend into a low permeability unit then the possibility of cross contamination from other aquifer layers is reduced and the system construction score goes down. If the highest production interval is more than 100 feet below the water table, then the system is considered to have better buffering capabilities. When information was adequate, a determination was made as to whether the casing and annular seals extend into low permeability units and whether current PWS construction standards are met.

Well driller's logs were available for the City of Aberdeen Well #2 and Well #3. The well construction information for Well #1 and Well #4 was obtained from Sanitary Surveys and/or the system operator.

The Idaho Department of Water Resources (IDWR) *Well Construction Standards Rules (1993)* require all public water systems (PWSs) to follow DEQ standards. IDAPA 58.01.08.550 requires that PWSs follow the *Recommended Standards for Water Works (1997)* during construction. Under current standards, all PWS wells are required to have a 50-foot buffer around the wellhead. These standards are used to rate the system construction for the well by evaluating items such as condition of wellhead and surface seal, whether the casing and annular space is within consolidated material or 18 feet below the surface, the thickness of the casing, etc. Pump tests for wells producing greater than 50 gallons per minute (gpm) require a minimum of a 6-hour test. If all criteria are not met, the public water source does not meet the IDWR Well Construction Standards.

The system construction scores were rated moderate for Well #1 and Well #3, and high for Well #2 and Well #4. The wellheads and surface seals were maintained and in acceptable condition. All wells are vented, but Well #2 and Well #4 are less than the required 18-inch height above the floor of the pump house (DEQ Sanitary Survey, 1999). The casings for Well #2 and Well #3 do not extend into a low permeable material. No well log data were available to make this determination for Well #1 and Well #4. When the well casing does not extend into a low permeable material such as clay, it increases the well's susceptibility to laterally migrating contamination. Well log data for Well #3 shows the highest water producing zone is at least 100 feet below static water level. This could not be determined for Well #1, Well #2, or Well #4. When water is drawn from deeper levels of the aquifer, it may provide a buffer from contaminants. All wells are located outside of a 100-year floodplain. This may decrease the chance of contaminants being drawn into the drinking water source from surface water flooding, but protection from surface water flooding is highly dependent on proper well house construction. All wells lack the required sanitary setback (50-feet radius) from the wellhead. Setting sanitary setback distances for the drinking water wells is important to prevent direct access to the wells and reduce the risk of contamination (Scheiss and Associates, September 1999, p. 2). A Summary of Aberdeen Well Construction information has been provided with this assessment (Table 1).

Table 1. Well Construction Summary for the City of Aberdeen

Well	Depth (feet)	Casing Diameter (inch)	Casing Thickness (inch)	Casing Depth (feet)	Static Water Level Below land surface (feet)	Screened Interval (feet)	Surface Seal Depth (feet)	Year Drilled	IDWR Standards Met?
1	235	10	NA	235	25	NA	NA	1916	No
2	265	12	NA	265	17	NA	NA	1958	No
3	295	16 14 10	0.250 0.250 0.250	156 275 290	21	265-275 280-290	75	1970	No
4	300	16 10	NA	262 300	20	NA	NA	1980	No

NA = Not Available

Potential Contaminant Source and Land Use

The potential contaminant sources and land use within the delineated zones of water contribution are assessed to determine each well's susceptibility. When agriculture is the predominant land use in the area, this may increase the likelihood of agricultural wastewater infiltrating the ground water system. Agricultural land is counted as a source of leachable contaminants and points are assigned to this rating based on the percentage of agricultural land. The land use in this area is considered irrigated cropland with a small percentage classified as urban use, specifically those areas along the major transportation corridor, Highway 39, through the City of Aberdeen.

In terms of potential contaminant sources and land use susceptibility, Well #1, Well #2, Well #3, and Well #4 rated high for IOCs (i.e., nitrates) and SOCs (i.e., pesticides), and moderate for VOCs (i.e. petroleum related products) and microbial contaminants (i.e., fecal coliform).

Final Susceptibility Rating

A detection above a drinking water standard (MCL), any detection of a VOC or SOC, or having potential contaminant sources within 50 feet of the wellhead will automatically give a high susceptibility rating to the final well ranking despite the land use of the area because a pathway for contamination already exists. If potential contaminant sources are within 50 feet of a wellhead, this will automatically lead to a high susceptibility rating. Additionally, the detect of a VOC (such as tetrachlorethylene in Well #1) or identification of a potential contaminant source at the wellhead (a chemical storage facility near Well #1) will effect the susceptibility rating. Hydrologic sensitivity and system construction scores are heavily weighted in the final scores.

Having multiple potential contaminant sources in the 0 to 3-year time of travel zone (Zone 1B) and a large percentage of agricultural land contribute greatly to the overall ranking. The final susceptibility rankings are: Well #1 is moderate for SOC, and high for IOC, VOC, and microbial contaminants. Well #2 and Well #4 are rated high for IOC, VOC, SOC, and microbial contaminants. Well #3 is rated moderate for IOC, VOC, SOC and microbial contaminants. These ratings reflect the hydrologic sensitivity, system construction, and potential contaminants inventory and land use within the delineated source water assessment areas for the Aberdeen well(s). Refer to Table 2 for the Susceptibility Analysis Summary.

Table 2. Summary of City of Aberdeen Susceptibility Evaluation

	Susceptibility Scores									
	Hydrologic Sensitivity	Contaminant Inventory[1]				System Construction	Final Susceptibility Ranking			
		IOC	VOC	SOC	Microbials		IOC	VOC	SOC	Microbials
Well #1	M	H	M	H	M	M	H	H*	M	H
Well #2	M	H	M	H	M	H	H	H	H	H
Well #3	L	H	M	H	M	M	M	M	M	M
Well #4	M	H	M	H	M	H	H	H	H	H

H = High Susceptibility, M = Moderate Susceptibility, L = Low Susceptibility; [1]IOC = inorganic chemical, VOC = volatile organic chemical, SOC = synthetic organic chemical; H* = well rated automatically high due to VOC detection in Well #1

Susceptibility Summary

The IOCs (barium, calcium, fluoride, nitrate, sodium) and RADs (Gross Alpha, Gross Beta, radium-226) represent the main water chemistry recorded for the Aberdeen public water system. The reported concentrations of these chemicals were well below the MCL for each chemical. The VOC, tetrachloroethylene, was found in Well #1 in 1995 and 1996. It was below the MCL for tetrachloroethylene and has not been recorded in the public water system since. All water chemistry tests for the Aberdeen wells have not detected SOCs.

The county level nitrogen fertilizer use, herbicide use and overall agriculture-chemical use is considered high in this area due to a significant amount of agricultural land. Although there may only be a small portion of agriculture land in the direct vicinity of the wellhead, it is useful as a tool in determining the overall chemical usage such as pesticides and how it may impact ground water through infiltration and surface water runoff. Potential contaminant sources were found within the wells delineated captures zones and documented (Attachment A – Table 3).

Section 4. Options for Drinking Water Protection

This assessment should be used as a basis for determining appropriate new protection measures or re-evaluating existing protection efforts. No matter what ranking a source receives, protection is always important. Whether the source is currently located in a "pristine" area or an area with numerous industrial and/or agricultural land uses that require surveillance, the way to ensure good water quality in the future is to act now to protect valuable water supply resources. If the system should need to expand in the future, new well sites should be located in areas with as few potential sources of contamination as possible, and the site should be reserved and protected for this specific use.

An effective drinking water protection program is tailored to the particular local drinking water protection area. A community with a fully developed drinking water protection program will incorporate many strategies. For drinking water protection, the City of Aberdeen should focus on correcting any deficiencies that were outlined in the sanitary survey. The wellheads need to be properly maintained and protected. Protection includes no application or storage of herbicides, pesticides or other chemicals within 50 feet from the wellhead. Limiting road access near wellheads can reduce the potential for contamination from spills or releases. If microbial contamination becomes a concern, the system should take appropriate measures to disinfect the system. If IOC levels increase, the system should investigate remediation options such as reverse osmosis. The City of Aberdeen is currently looking to improve their water system. Some modifications being evaluated are upgrades to the distribution lines and fire hydrants, and upgrades to the wells and well houses (Schiess & Associates, September 1999). Once drinking water wells are protected, the system can focus on documenting types and locations of potential contaminant sources. These potential contaminant sources can be point sources, such as a new gas station, or non-point sources, such as storm water runoff. Any new sources that may be considered potential contaminants should be investigated and if need be monitored to prevent future contamination. Land uses within the area should also be evaluated. Areas with higher than normal agricultural land use may have increases in agricultural wastewater runoff that could infiltrate the ground water. Land uses within most of the source water assessment area are outside the direct jurisdiction of the City of Aberdeen. Therefore partnerships with state and local agencies, industrial and commercial groups should be established to ensure future land uses are protective of ground water quality. Educating employees and the public about source water will further assist the system in its monitoring and protection efforts.

Due to the time involved with the movement of ground water, drinking water protection activities should be aimed at long-term management strategies even though these strategies may not yield results in the near term. A strong public education program should be a primary focus of any drinking water protection plan as the delineation encompasses much urban and commercial land uses. Public education topics could include proper lawn and garden care practices, household hazardous waste disposal methods, proper care and maintenance of septic systems, and the importance of water conservation to name but a few. There are multiple resources available to help communities implement protection programs, including the Drinking Water Academy of the EPA. Drinking water protection activities for agriculture should be coordinated with the Idaho State Department of Agriculture and the Bingham County Soil and Water Conversation District. As major transportation corridors intersect the delineation (such as Highway 39), the Idaho Department of Transportation should be involved in protection efforts. If the system should need to expand in the future, new well sites should be located in areas with as few potential sources of contamination as possible, and the site should be reserved and protected for this specific use.

A community system must incorporate a variety of strategies in order to develop a comprehensive drinking water protection plan, be they regulatory in nature (i.e. zoning ordinances) or non-regulatory (i.e. public education, specific best management practices). For assistance in developing protection strategies please contact the Pocatello Regional Office of the DEQ or the Idaho Rural Water Association.

Assistance

Public water supplies and others may call the following DEQ offices with questions about this assessment and to request assistance with developing and implementing a local protection plan. In addition, draft protection plans may be submitted to the DEQ office for preliminary review and comments.

DEQ Pocatello Regional Office (208) 236-6160

DEQ State Office (208) 373-0502

Website: http://www.deq.state.id.us

Water suppliers serving fewer than 10,000 persons may contact Melinda Harper (mlharper@idahoruralwater.com), Idaho Rural Water Association, at (208) 343-7001 for assistance with drinking water protection (formerly wellhead protection) strategies.

References

Ackerman, D.J., 1995, Analysis of Steady-State Flow and Advective Transport in the Eastern Snake River Plain Aquifer System, Idaho, U.S. Geological Survey Water-Resources Investigations Report 94-4257, 25 p. I-FY95

Bechtel Environmental, Inc., 1994, Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study, Groundwater Flow Monitoring Report, 95 p.

Corbett, M.K., J.E. Anderson, and J.C. Mitchell, 1980, An Evaluation of Thermal Water Occurrences in the Tyhee Area, Bannock County, Idaho, Idaho Department of Water Resources, Water Information Bulletin, No. 30, 67 p.

Cosgrove, D.M., G.S. Johnson, S. Laney, and J, Lindgren, 1999, Description of the IDWR/UI Snake River Plain Aquifer Model (SRPAM), Idaho Water Resources Research Institute, University of Idaho, 95 p.

deSonneville, J.L.J, 1972, Development of a Mathematical Groundwater Model: Water Resources Research Institute, University of Idaho, Moscow, Idaho, 227 p.

Drinking Water Information Management System (DWIMS). Idaho Department of Environmental Quality.

Drilling description for Well #2 City of Aberdeen. Source Unknown. February 1958.

Engineering Report Water System Improvements Aberdeen, Id. Schiess & Associates Consulting Engineers, Project No. 99014, September 1999, Revised September 2001.

Garabedian, S.P., 1992, Hydrology and Digital Simulation of the Regional Aquifer System, Eastern Snake River Plain, Idaho, U.S. Geological Survey Professional Paper 1408-F, 102 p., 10 pl. I-FY92.

Great Lakes-Upper Mississippi River Board of State and Provincial Public Health and Environment Managers, 1997. “Recommended Standards for Water Works.”

GWUDI (Ground Water Under Direct Influence) Field Survey. Idaho Department of Environmental Quality, September 1995.

Idaho Department of Environmental Quality. 2000. Design Standards for Public Drinking Water Systems. IDAPA 58.01.08.550.01.

Idaho Department of Environmental Quality. 2001. Sanitary Survey of City of Aberdeen: PWS #6060001, Bingham County

Idaho Department of Environmental Quality. Source Water Assessment Program Public Water System Questionnaire. September 2000.

Idaho Division of Environmental Quality Ground Water Program, October 1999. Idaho Source Water Assessment Plan.

Idaho Department of Water Resources, 1993. Administrative Rules of the Idaho Water Resource Board: Well Construction Standards Rules. IDAPA 37.03.09.

Idaho Department of Water Resources. Well Driller's Log for Well #3 City of Aberdeen, January, 1970.

Idaho Department of Water Resources, 1997, Upper Snake River Basin Study, 85 p.

IDWR - see Idaho Department of Water Resources.

Jacobson, N.D., 1984, Hydrogeology of Eastern Michaud Flats, Fort Hall Indian Reservation, Idaho,

Jacobson, N.D., 1982, Ground-Water Conditions in the Eastern Part of Michaud Flats, Fort Hall Indian Reservation, Idaho, U.S. Geological Survey Open-File Report 82-570, 35 p.

Kjelstrom, L.C., 1995, Streamflow Gains and Losses in the Snake River and Ground-Water Budgets for the Snake River Plain, Idaho and Eastern Oregon, U.S. Geological Survey Professional Paper 1408-C, 47 p. I-FY95.

Lindholm, G.F., 1996, Summary of the Snake River Plain Regional Aquifer-System analysis in Idaho and Eastern Oregon, U.S. Geological Survey Professional Paper 1408-A, 59 p.

State Drinking Water Information System (SDWIS). Idaho Department of Environmental Quality.

United States Geological Survey, 2001, Current Streamflow Conditions, http://idaho.usgs.gov/rt-cgi/gen_tbl_pg.

USGS - see United States Geological Survey.

Washington Group International, Inc, October 2001. Source Area Delineation Report for the East Margin Area of the Eastern Snake River Plain Hydrologic Province.

Whitehead, R.L., 1992, Geohydrologic Framework of the Snake River Plain Regional Aquifer System, Idaho and Eastern Oregon, U.S. Geological Survey Professional Paper 1408-B, 32p. I-FY92

POTENTIAL CONTAMINANT INVENTORY
LIST OF ACRONYMS AND DEFINITIONS

AST (Aboveground Storage Tanks) – Sites with aboveground storage tanks.

Business Mailing List – This list contains potential contaminant sites identified through a yellow pages database search of standard industry codes (SIC).

CERCLIS – This includes sites considered for listing under the **Comprehensive Environmental Response Compensation and Liability Act (CERCLA)**. CERCLA, more commonly known as A Superfund is designed to clean up hazardous waste sites that are on the national priority list (NPL).

Cyanide Site – DEQ permitted and known historical sites/facilities using cyanide.

Dairy – Sites included in the primary contaminant source inventory represent those facilities regulated by Idaho State Department of Agriculture (ISDA) and may range from a few head to several thousand head of milking cows.

Deep Injection Well – Injection wells regulated under the Idaho Department of Water Resources generally for the disposal of stormwater runoff or agricultural field drainage.

Enhanced Inventory – Enhanced inventory locations are potential contaminant source sites added by the water system. These can include new sites not captured during the primary contaminant inventory, or corrected locations for sites not properly located during the primary contaminant inventory. Enhanced inventory sites can also include miscellaneous sites added by the Idaho Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) during the primary contaminant inventory.

Floodplain – This is a coverage of the 100-year floodplains.

Group 1 Sites – These are sites that show elevated levels of contaminants and are not within the priority one areas.

Inorganic Priority Area – Priority one areas where greater than 25% of the wells/springs show constituents higher than primary standards or other health standards.

Landfill – Areas of open and closed municipal and non-municipal landfills.

LUST (Leaking Underground Storage Tank) – Potential contaminant source sites associated with leaking underground storage tanks as regulated under RCRA.

Mines and Quarries – Mines and quarries permitted through the Idaho Department of Lands.)

Nitrate Priority Area – Area where greater than 25% of wells/springs show nitrate values above 5 mg/L.

NPDES (National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System) – Sites with NPDES permits. The Clean Water Act requires that any discharge of a pollutant to waters of the United States from a point source must be authorized by an NPDES permit.

Organic Priority Areas – These are any areas where greater than 25 % of wells/springs show levels greater than 1% of the primary standard or other health standards.

Recharge Point – This includes active, proposed, and possible recharge sites on the Snake River Plain.

RCRIS – Site regulated under **Resource Conservation Recovery Act (RCRA)**. RCRA is commonly associated with the cradle to grave management approach for generation, storage, and disposal of hazardous wastes.

SARA Tier II (Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act Tier II Facilities) – These sites store certain types and amounts of hazardous materials and must be identified under the Community Right to Know Act.

Toxic Release Inventory (TRI) – The toxic release inventory list was developed as part of the Emergency Planning and Community Right to Know (Community Right to Know) Act passed in 1986. The Community Right to Know Act requires the reporting of any release of a chemical found on the TRI list.

UST (Underground Storage Tank) – Potential contaminant source sites associated with underground storage tanks regulated as regulated under RCRA.

Wastewater Land Applications Sites – These are areas where the land application of municipal or industrial wastewater is permitted by DEQ.

Wellheads – These are drinking water well locations regulated under the Safe Drinking Water Act. They are not treated as potential contaminant sources.

NOTE: Many of the potential contaminant sources were located using a geocoding program where mailing addresses are used to locate a facility. Field verification of potential contaminant sources is an important element of an enhanced inventory.

Attachment A

City of Aberdeen
Potential Contaminant Inventories (Table 3)
and Delineated Areas (Figure 2)

Table 3. City of Aberdeen Wells Potential Contaminant Inventory.

TOT Zone (years)[2]	*Site Number(s)	Source(s) Description[1]	Source(s) Information	Potential Contaminants[3]
0-3	1, 6, 57	UST-Open, LUST-Cleanup Incomplete, AST Site	Database/Enhanced Inventory	VOC, SOC
0-3	2, 7, 28	LUST-Cleanup Incomplete, UST-Open, SARA Site	Database Inventory	VOC, SOC
0-3	3, 5	LUST-Cleanup Completed, UST-Closed	Database Inventory	IOC, VOC, SOC
0-3	4, 27, 41	UST-Closed, SARA Site, AST	Database/Enhanced Inventory	IOC, VOC, SOC
0-3	9	UST-Closed	Database Inventory	VOC, SOC
0-3	10, 55	UST-Open, LUST-Cleanup Incomplete	Enhanced Inventory	VOC, SOC
0-3	13	Business Mailing List Site-Fertilizers (Wholesale)	Database Inventory	IOC, SOC
0-3	14	Business Mailing List Site-Chemicals (Wholesale)	Database Inventory	IOC, SOC
0-3	15	Business Mailing List Site-Auto Parts/Supplies	Database Inventory	VOC, SOC
0-3	16	Business Mailing List Site-Tire Dealers	Database Inventory	VOC, SOC
0-3	17, 31	Business Mailing List-Oils/Fuel (Wholesale), AST Site	Database Inventory	IOC, VOC, SOC
0-3	18	Business Mailing List Site-Potato Growers	Database Inventory	IOC, Microbials
0-3	19	Business Mailing List Site-Motorcycle Dealers	Database Inventory	VOC, SOC
0-3	20	Business Mailing List Site-Truck Dealers	Database Inventory	VOC, SOC
0-3	21	Business Mailing List Site-Potato Growers	Database Inventory	IOC, Microbials
0-3	22	Service Stations-Gasoline & Oil	Database Inventory	VOC, SOC
0-3	25	RCRA Site	Database Inventory	VOC, SOC
0-3	26	SARA Site	Database Inventory	IOC
0-3	29, 30	SARA Site, AST Site	Database Inventory	VOC, SOC
0-3	32	AST	Database Inventory	VOC, SOC
0-3	36	Group 1	Database Inventory	VOC
0-3	42	Business Mailing List Site-Thinner/Paints	Enhanced Inventory	VOC
0-3	43	Hand dug well	Enhanced Inventory	IOC, VOC, SOC
0-3	44	Hand dug well	Enhanced Inventory	IOC, VOC, SOC
0-3	48	UST-Closed	Enhanced Inventory	VOC, SOC
0-3	49	UST-Closed	Enhanced Inventory	VOC, SOC
0-3	52, 56	UST-Open, LUST-Open	Enhanced Inventory	VOC, SOC
0-3	58	Business Mailing List Site-Chemicals/Fertilizers	Enhanced Inventory	IOC, SOC
0-3	59	AST	Enhanced Inventory	VOC, SOC
0-3	60	Railroad	Map Inventory	IOC, VOC, SOC, Microbials
0-3	61	Major throughfair	Map Inventory	IOC, VOC, SOC, Microbials
0-3	62	Surface Water	Map Inventory	IOC, VOC, SOC, Microbials
0-3	63	Surface Water	Map Inventory	IOC, VOC, SOC, Microbials
0-3	66	Business Mailing List Site-Paints	Enhanced Inventory	VOC
0-3	67	Surface Water	Enhanced Inventory	IOC, VOC, SOC, Microbials
0-3	68	Former UST	Enhanced Inventory	VOC, SOC
0-3	69	Hand-dug well	Enhanced Inventory	IOC, VOC, SOC
0-3	70	Business Mailing List Site-Potato Processing Facility	Enhanced Inventory	IOC, Microbials

TOT Zone (years)[2]	*Site Number(s)	Source(s) Description[1]	Source(s) Information	Potential Contaminants[3]
3-6	37	Group 1	Database Inventory	SOC
6-10	38	UST-Open (Farm)	Database Inventory	VOC, SOC
6-10	39	UST-Open	Database Inventory	VOC, SOC
6-10	40	Mine	Database Inventory	IOC, VOC, SOC
6-10	64	Major throughfair	Map Inventory	IOC, VOC, SOC
6-10	65	Railroad	Map Inventory	IOC, VOC, SOC

[1] LUST = leaking underground storage tank, UST = underground storage tank, AST = aboveground storage tank, RCRA = Resource Conservation Recovery Act Site, SARA = Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act Tier II Facilities

[2] TOT = time-of-travel (in years) for a potential contaminant to reach the wellhead

[3] IOC = inorganic chemical, VOC = volatile organic chemical, SOC = synthetic organic chemical

*Site Numbers are non-sequential.

FIGURE 2. City of Aberdeen (PWS# 6060001) Wells #1, #2, #3, & #4 Delineation Map and Potential Inventory Contaminant Source Locations



0 5 10 15 20 25 Miles

8 0 8 16 24 Kilometers

1:175000

LEGEND

PCI IDTM
- 1B (3 yr TOT)
- 2 (6 yr TOT)
- 3 (10 yr TOT)
- Wellhead
- Enhanced Inventory
- CERCLIS Site
- RCRIS Site
- Dairy
- LUST Site
- Closed UST Site
- Open UST Site
- Business Mailing List
- NPDES Site
- Mine
- AST
- Toxic Release Inventory
- SARA Title III Site (EPCRA)
- Recharge Point
- Injection Well
- Group1 Site
- Cyanide Site
- Landfill
- Wastewater Land Application Site

W. Kelley 12/11/01
Modified by N. Byrd 5/1/02

N

IDAHO DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY

Attachment B

City of Aberdeen
Susceptibility Analysis
Worksheets

The final scores for the susceptibility analysis were determined using the following formulas:

1) VOC/SOC/IOC Final Score = Hydrologic Sensitivity + System Construction + (Potential Contaminant/Land Use x 0.2)

2) Microbial Final Score = Hydrologic Sensitivity + System Construction + (Potential Contaminant/Land Use x 0.375)

Final Susceptibility Scoring:

0 - 5 Low Susceptibility

6 - 12 Moderate Susceptibility

≥ 13 High Susceptibility

Ground Water Susceptibility Report   Public Water System Name : ABERDEEN CITY OF   Well# : WELL #1
Public Water System Number 6060001   5/2/02 10:53:27 AM

1. System Construction

		SCORE
Drill Date	1/1/1916	
Driller Log Available	NO	
Sanitary Survey (if yes, indicate date of last survey)	YES	1999
Well meets IDWR construction standards	NO	1
Wellhead and surface seal maintained	YES	0
Casing and annular seal extend to low permeability unit	NO	2
Highest production 100 feet below static water level	NO	1
Well located outside the 100 year flood plain	YES	0
Total System Construction Score		4

2. Hydrologic Sensitivity

Soils are poorly to moderately drained	YES	0
Vadose zone composed of gravel, fractured rock or unknown	YES	1
Depth to first water > 300 feet	NO	1
Aquitard present with > 50 feet cumulative thickness	NO	2
Total Hydrologic Score		4

3. Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE 1A

		IOC Score	VOC Score	SOC Score	Microbial Score
Land Use Zone 1A	IRRIGATED CROPLAND	2	2	2	2
Farm chemical use high	YES	2	0	2	
IOC, VOC, SOC, or Microbial sources in Zone 1A	YES	NO	YES	NO	NO
Total Potential Contaminant Source/Land Use Score - Zone 1A		4	2	4	2

Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE 1B

		IOC Score	VOC Score	SOC Score	Microbial Score
Contaminant sources present (Number of Sources)	YES	18	30	31	8
(Score = # Sources X 2) 8 Points Maximum		8	8	8	8
Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	12	23	11	
4 Points Maximum		4	4	4	
Zone 1B contains or intercepts a Group 1 Area	NO	0	0	0	0
Land use Zone 1B	Greater Than 50% Irrigated Agricultural Land	4	4	4	4
Total Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone 1B		16	16	16	12

Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE II

		IOC Score	VOC Score	SOC Score	Microbial Score
Contaminant Sources Present	NO	0	0	0	
Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	1	0	0	
Land Use Zone II	Less than 25% Agricultural Land	0	0	0	
Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone II		1	0	0	0

Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE III

		IOC Score	VOC Score	SOC Score	Microbial Score
Contaminant Source Present	YES	1	1	1	
Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	1	1	1	

Is there irrigated agricultural lands that occupy > 50% of	NO	0	0	0	
Total Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone III		2	2	2	0
Cumulative Potential Contaminant / Land Use Score		23	20	22	14
4. Final Susceptibility Source Score		13	12	12	13
5. Final Well Ranking		High	High	Moderate	High

Ground Water Susceptibility Report   Public Water System Name : ABERDEEN CITY OF   Well# : WELL #2

Public Water System Number 6060001   5/2/02 10:53:27 AM

1. System Construction

		SCORE
Drill Date	2/8/58	
Driller Log Available	YES	
Sanitary Survey (if yes, indicate date of last survey)	YES	1999
Well meets IDWR construction standards	NO	1
Wellhead and surface seal maintained	YES	0
Casing and annular seal extend to low permeability unit	NO	2
Highest production 100 feet below static water level	NO	1
Well located outside the 100 year flood plain	NO	1
Total System Construction Score		5

2. Hydrologic Sensitivity

Soils are poorly to moderately drained	YES	0
Vadose zone composed of gravel, fractured rock or unknown	YES	1
Depth to first water > 300 feet	NO	1
Aquitard present with > 50 feet cumulative thickness	NO	2
Total Hydrologic Score		4

3. Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE 1A

		IOC Score	VOC Score	SOC Score	Microbial Score
Land Use Zone 1A	IRRIGATED CROPLAND	2	2	2	2
Farm chemical use high	YES	2	0	2	
IOC, VOC, SOC, or Microbial sources in Zone 1A	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
Total Potential Contaminant Source/Land Use Score - Zone 1A		4	2	4	2

Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE 1B

		IOC Score	VOC Score	SOC Score	Microbial Score
Contaminant sources present (Number of Sources)	YES	18	30	31	8
(Score = # Sources X 2) 8 Points Maximum		8	8	8	8
Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	12	23	11	
4 Points Maximum		4	4	4	
Zone 1B contains or intercepts a Group 1 Area	NO	0	0	0	0
Land use Zone 1B	Greater Than 50% Irrigated Agricultural Land	4	4	4	4
Total Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone 1B		16	16	16	12

Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE II

		IOC Score	VOC Score	SOC Score	Microbial Score
Contaminant Sources Present	NO	0	0	0	
Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	1	0	0	
Land Use Zone II	Less than 25% Agricultural Land	0	0	0	
Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone II		1	0	0	0

Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE III

		IOC Score	VOC Score	SOC Score	Microbial Score
Contaminant Source Present	YES	1	1	1	
Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	1	1	1	

Is there irrigated agricultural lands that occupy > 50% of	NO	0	0	0	
Total Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone III		2	2	2	0
Cumulative Potential Contaminant / Land Use Score		23	20	22	14
4. Final Susceptibility Source Score		14	13	13	14
5. Final Well Ranking		High	High	High	High

Ground Water Susceptibility Report   Public Water System Name : ABERDEEN CITY OF   Well# : WELL #3

Public Water System Number 6060001   5/2/02 10:53:27 AM

1. System Construction

		SCORE
Drill Date	1/1/70	
Driller Log Available	YES	
Sanitary Survey (if yes, indicate date of last survey)	YES	1999
Well meets IDWR construction standards	NO	1
Wellhead and surface seal maintained	YES	0
Casing and annular seal extend to low permeability unit	NO	2
Highest production 100 feet below static water level	YES	0
Well located outside the 100 year flood plain	YES	0
Total System Construction Score		3

2. Hydrologic Sensitivity

Soils are poorly to moderately drained	YES	0
Vadose zone composed of gravel, fractured rock or unknown	NO	0
Depth to first water > 300 feet	NO	1
Aquitard present with > 50 feet cumulative thickness	YES	0
Total Hydrologic Score		1

3. Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE 1A

		IOC Score	VOC Score	SOC Score	Microbial Score
Land Use Zone 1A	IRRIGATED CROPLAND	2	2	2	2
Farm chemical use high	YES	2	0	2	
IOC, VOC, SOC, or Microbial sources in Zone 1A	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
Total Potential Contaminant Source/Land Use Score - Zone 1A		4	2	4	2

Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE 1B

		IOC Score	VOC Score	SOC Score	Microbial Score
Contaminant sources present (Number of Sources)	YES	18	30	31	8
(Score = # Sources X 2) 8 Points Maximum		8	8	8	8
Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	12	23	11	
4 Points Maximum		4	4	4	
Zone 1B contains or intercepts a Group 1 Area	NO	0	0	0	0
Land use Zone 1B	Greater Than 50% Irrigated Agricultural Land	4	4	4	4
Total Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone 1B		16	16	16	12

Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE II

		IOC Score	VOC Score	SOC Score	Microbial Score
Contaminant Sources Present	NO	0	0	0	
Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	1	0	0	
Land Use Zone II	Less than 25% Agricultural Land	0	0	0	
Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone II		1	0	0	0

Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE III

		IOC Score	VOC Score	SOC Score	Microbial Score
Contaminant Source Present	YES	1	1	1	
Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	1	1	1	

Is there irrigated agricultural lands that occupy > 50% of	NO	0	0	0	
Total Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone III		2	2	2	0
Cumulative Potential Contaminant / Land Use Score		23	20	22	14
4. Final Susceptibility Source Score		9	8	8	9
5. Final Well Ranking		Moderate	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate

Ground Water Susceptibility Report   Public Water System Name : ABERDEEN CITY OF   Well# : WELL #4
Public Water System Number 6060001   5/2/02 10:53:27 AM

1. System Construction		SCORE
Drill Date	1/1/80	
Driller Log Available	NO	
Sanitary Survey (if yes, indicate date of last survey)	YES	1999
Well meets IDWR construction standards	NO	1
Wellhead and surface seal maintained	YES	0
Casing and annular seal extend to low permeability unit	NO	2
Highest production 100 feet below static water level	NO	1
Well located outside the 100 year flood plain	NO	1
	Total System Construction Score	5

2. Hydrologic Sensitivity		
Soils are poorly to moderately drained	YES	0
Vadose zone composed of gravel, fractured rock or unknown	YES	1
Depth to first water > 300 feet	NO	1
Aquitard present with > 50 feet cumulative thickness	NO	2
	Total Hydrologic Score	4

3. Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE 1A		IOC Score	VOC Score	SOC Score	Microbial Score
Land Use Zone 1A	IRRIGATED CROPLAND	2	2	2	2
Farm chemical use high	YES	2	0	2	
IOC, VOC, SOC, or Microbial sources in Zone 1A	YES	NO	YES	NO	NO
Total Potential Contaminant Source/Land Use Score - Zone 1A		4	2	4	2

Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE 1B					
Contaminant sources present (Number of Sources)	YES	18	30	31	8
(Score = # Sources X 2) 8 Points Maximum		8	8	8	8
Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	12	23	11	
4 Points Maximum		4	4	4	
Zone 1B contains or intercepts a Group 1 Area	NO	0	0	0	0
Land use Zone 1B	Greater Than 50% Irrigated Agricultural Land	4	4	4	4
Total Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone 1B		16	16	16	12

Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE II					
Contaminant Sources Present	NO	0	0	0	
Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	1	0	0	
Land Use Zone II	Less than 25% Agricultural Land	0	0	0	
Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone II		1	0	0	0

Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE III				
Contaminant Source Present	YES	1	1	1

Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	1	1	1	
Is there irrigated agricultural lands that occupy > 50% of	NO	0	0	0	
Total Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone III		2	2	2	0
Cumulative Potential Contaminant / Land Use Score		23	20	22	14
4. Final Susceptibility Source Score		14	13	13	14
5. Final Well Ranking		High	High	High	High